DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 796 FL 017 600

AUTHOR Friedman, Grace Ibanez; And Others
TITLE The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Kindergarten through Ninth-Grade Teachers and Supervisors 1986-1987. OEA Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.
SPONS AGENCY New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of Bilingual Education.
PUB DATE [88]
GRANT 5001-42-78402
NOTE 27p.; Prepared by the O.E.A. Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit.
AVAILABLE FROM New York City Board of Education, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, NY 11201.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Bilingual Teachers; Classroom Techniques; Educational Policy; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; Language Teachers; Limited English Speaking; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public School Teachers; Supervisors; Supervisory Training; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

In 1986-87, the New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/English as a Second Language (ESL) Kindergarten through Ninth-Grade Teachers and Supervisors provided in-service training in bilingual education theory, policy, and practice to about 500 teachers and administrators serving limited-English-proficient (LEP) students in the city's 32 community school districts. Each participant received about 12 hours of training in a series of sessions geared to supervisors and coordinators, experienced teachers, or new teachers. Workshops were offered in different locations. The program evaluation gathered information about participant characteristics, training, and experience. The program met and surpassed its objectives in attendance rates and participant satisfaction. Recommendations for program improvement include follow-up conferences, and specialized training for teachers in other than Spanish bilingual programs. (Author/MSE)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

THE NEW YORK CITY
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L.
KINDERGARTEN THROUGH NINTH-GRADE
TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS
1986-1987

# OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

O.E.A. Evaluation Section Report

Robert Tobias, Administrator of Evaluation
Judith S. Torres, Senior Manager

Grant Number: 5001-42-78402

# THE NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L. KINDERGARTEN THROUGH NINTH-GRADE TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS 1986-1987

Prepared by the O.E.A.
Bilingual Education
Evaluation Unit

Jose Villegas,
Unit Manager

Grace Ibanez Friedman,
Principal Investigator

Shelley M. Fischer,
Data Analyst

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

## A SUMMARY OF THE REPORT

The 1986-87 New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Kindergarten Through Ninth-Grade Teachers and Supervisors was funded by New York State Education Department bilingual categorical funds. It was administered by the New York City Board of Education's Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.). The purpose of the program was to provide in-service training in bilingual-education theory, policy, and practice to 500 teachers and administrators serving limited English proficient (LEP) students in New York City's 32 community school districts.

Each participant received approximately 12 hours of training in a series of four three-hour sessions. The sessions included a keynote address by a guest speaker on major issues in bilingual education/E.S.L, followed by 8-13 training workshops conducted by experienced practitioners. The sessions were held at four centrally-located public schools in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens -- the boroughs with New York City's largest LEP enrollments. At each location, three types of workshop were offered: one for supervisors and coordinators; one for experienced teachers; and one for new teachers. Each workshop served 18-22 participants. The sessions took place between February and June, from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M.

Topics of the workshops for supervisors and coordinators included: testing; placement of LEP students in bilingual/E.S.L. programs; parental notification and options; implementation of bilingual/E.S.L. instructional programs; staffing requirements; and funding of bilingual/E.S.L. programs. Topics of the workshops for teachers included: fundamental aspects of learning to read for the LEP child; strategies for improving first and second language skills for LEP students; teaching communication arts in Spanish to Spanish-speaking students in bilingual programs; and the teaching of writing skills for junior high school E.S.L. teachers. All workshops had hands-on activities as well as lectures and discussions.

While the director of the Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.) had overall responsibiliity, a Deputy Director of O.B.E. supervised the Staff Development Program. Her principal responsibility was to direct the activities of four field supervisors, each of whom was in charge of one site. The field supervisors hired consultants to make presentations; recruited, selected, and assigned participants to workshops; outlined the content and format of workshops; monitored workshops; and completed the paperwork associated with the project.

The project's 500 participants came from all 32 of New York City's community school districts, but 231 (46 percent) came from just five districts. Two hundred and ninety-four (59 percent) of the participants had at least a master's degree; of these, 320 (64 percent) were specialized in bilingual education,

elementary education, or English as a second language (E.S.L.). Most of the participants were licensed or certified in common branches or bilingual common branches. The majority had taught in grades kindergarten through nine for an average of five years, although some had experience teaching at the high school level. A total of 231 (47 percent) were currently assigned as bilingual teachers, and 147 (30 percent) were currently assigned as E.S.L. teachers.

The evaluation of the 1986-87 Staff Development Program assessed its effectiveness in accomplishing the two objectives it had proposed to the Bureau of Bilingual Education of the New York State Education Department: that 80 percent of the participants would attend all four sessions; and that 90 percent would be highly satisfied with the clarity, scope, thoroughness, amount learned, and usefulness of the program, and would give it a positive overall rating. (All six satisfaction variables were measured by a five-point Likert scale.) Based on the number of evaluation forms that were returned for each session (448 to 482, depending on the site), the program surpassed its objective of an 80 percent attendance rate at all four sites at all four sessions. The mean satisfaction rating for each of the six variables was 4.4 or higher, indicating that virtually all of the participants were highly satisfied with the program in every respect.

The evaluation team makes the following recommendations for improving the program:

- Follow-up conferences might be useful. Such conferences would give participants a chance to discuss their implementation of teaching techniques learned in previous workshops.

- Although the need for specialized training clearly is greatest for teachers serving Hispanic LEP students, since they are the largest single language-minority population in the New York City schools, teachers serving other language groups might also need specialized training. Although it might not be possible to devote an entire series to these teachers, perhaps a few sessions at each site could be devoted to their special needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this report, as of all Office of Educational Assessment Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit reports, is the result of a cooperative effort of regular staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Arthur Lopatin has edited the manuscripts. Margaret Scorza has reviewed and corrected reports, and has coordinated the editing and production process. Martin Kohli has spent many hours, creating, correcting, and maintaining data files. Maria Grazia Asselle, Rosalyn Alvarez, Donna Plotkin, and Milton Vickerman have interpreted student achievement and integrated their findings into reports. Finally, Betty Morales has worked intensively to produce, duplicate, and disseminate the completed documents. Without their able and faithful participation, the unit could not have handled such a large volume of work and still have produced quality evaluation reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | OVERVIEW | 1 |
| | Program Design | 2 |
| | Program Organization | 3 |
| II. | PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS | 5 |
| III. | WORKSHOP DESCRIPTIONS | 8 |
| | Workshops for Supervisors | 9 |
| | Workshops for Teachers | 9 |
| | Attendance | 10 |
| | Satisfaction | 10 |
| IV. | FINDINGS | 12 |
| V. | RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS | 13 |
| VI. | CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 15 |
| | Conclusions | 15 |
| | Recommendations | 17 |

LIST OF TABLES


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Table 1: | Number and Percent of Program Participants by Country of Birth. | 5 |
| Table 2: | Participants' Educational Backgrounds: Areas of Concentration. | 6 |
| Table 3: | Overall Average Satisfaction Ratings for Each Dimension. | 11 |

NEW YORK CITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR BILINGUAL/E.S.L. KINDERGARTEN THROUGH NINTH-GRADE TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS

| | |
|---|---|
| Program Location: | Office of Bilingual Education<br>131 Livingston Street<br>Brooklyn, New York 11201 |
| Year Of Operation: | 1986-1987 |
| Target Population: | Bilingual/E.S.L. Teachers and Supervisors (Kindergarten through Ninth Grade) |
| Program Director: | Angela Bazley |

## I. OVERVIEW

As the result of a needs assessment, in 1983-84 the Office of Bilingual Education (O.B.E.) of the New York City Board of Education began a staff development project for bilingual early childhood teachers. Because this project was so successful, O.B.E. followed up with a similar teacher-training project for middle and junior high school bilingual teachers. The New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Kindergarten Through Ninth-Grade Teachers and Building Supervisors was thus the fourth in a series of staff development projects offered by O.B.E. Like its predecessors, it offered wide-reaching in-service training to teachers and supervisors who serve LEP students in the New York City community school districts. The project was funded by New York State Education Department bilingual categorical funds.

Although bilingual/E.S.L. teachers and supervisors in CAR*

---

*CAR refers to schools cited in the New York State Education Department's Comprehension Assessment Report for low achievement in reading and writing.

schools were enrolled on a priority basis, selection requirements were broad enough to include a wide range of personnel. The O.B.E. felt that the extra effort involved in serving a heterogenous group was worthwhile in view of the potential benefits to students.

During the year under review, the program served 500 teachers and supervisors. Each participant received approximately 12 hours of training over a four-week period.

PROGRAM DESIGN

In previous years, training had been provided at a single site on Saturday mornings over a six-week period. The 1986-87 program expanded upon this model, using O.B.E.'s extensive expertise in bilingual/E.S.L. education and in conducting in-service training. Training was offered as a four-evening series (from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M.) at one site in each of the four boroughs with the highest concentrations of LEP students -- Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx. Thus, the program consisted of a total of sixteen training sessions between February and June of 1987.

The topics at these workshops included mastery learning; teaching reading using an E.S.L. approach; teaching critical thinking skills in the content areas; classroom management; and effective uses of learning principles. The workshops included hands-on activities, discussions, and the distribution of hand-outs relevant to each topic.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

The director of O.B.E. had overall responsibility for the program, while direction and coordination were the responsibility of one of O.B.E.'s deputy directors. The latter directed the field supervisors, who in turn monitored on-site activities; hired consultants to make presentations; recruited, selected, and assigned participants to workshops; determined the content and format for the sessions; and made provisions for completing the necessary paperwork.

O.B.E. distributed a memorandum about the program to all 32 New York City community school districts. The memorandum described the program; provided information about pre-registration requirements and the stipend for participation; and noted dates, times, and locations of the workshops. Applications required three signatures: the applicant's, the school principal's, and the district superintendent's. In order to complete the necessary arrangements on time, applications were due at central headquarters by a fixed date. Applicants who were accepted were notified by phone.

Participants evaluated the workshops using forms developed by the Office of Educational Assessment. Participants were asked to report their satisfaction with the clarity, scope, thoroughness, and usefulness of the workshops. One set of evaluations was collected immediately after the guest speaker's presentation at the first session, and the second set was collected after the completion of the series. Participants also

completed a background questionnaire.

## II. PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Program participants came from all of New York City's 32 community school districts (C.S.D.s). Of the 497 participants who completed the background questionnaire, 39 percent were from just five districts: 56 were from C.S.D. 32; 48 from C.S.D. 30; 46 from C.D.S. 19; and 42 from C.S.D. 6. The other districts each had fewer than 40 participants.

The participants were heterogeneous with respect to national origin, specialization in college and graduate school, and years and type of teaching experience. Two hundred and thirty-one teachers (47 percent) were born in the United States and 107 (22 percent) were born in Puerto Rico. Of the remaining participants, the majority were born in Spanish-speaking countries of Central and South America (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Program Participants by Country of Birth

| Country of Birth | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| U.S.A. | 231 | 47 |
| Puerto Rico | 107 | 22 |
| Cuba | 41 | 8 |
| Dominican Republic | 12 | 2 |
| Haiti | 11 | 2 |
| Other Central and South American | 54 | 11 |
| Europe | 21 | 4 |
| Asia | 8 | 2 |
| Africa | 1 | 0* |
| TOTAL | 486 | 100 |

*Less than one percent

- Most participants were born in the United States and Puerto Rico.

The participants were very well prepared academically: 294 had (59 percent) at least a master's degree, and 41 (9 percent) indicated more advanced study. Only 143 (29 percent) did not yet have a master's degree, but at least 88 (18 percent) of them indicated having a graduate major. The participants' undergraduate and graduate majors are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Participants' Educational Backgrounds:
Areas of Concentration

| AREA | BACHELOR N | BACHELOR (%) | GRADUATE N | GRADUATE (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English as a Second Language | 16 | 3.3 | 62 | 13.7 |
| Bilingual Education | 55 | 11.3 | 153 | 33.8 |
| Early Childhood | 29 | 6.0 | 30 | 6.6 |
| Elementary Education | 141 | 29.1 | 61 | 13.5 |
| Secondary Education | 23 | 4.7 | 16 | 3.5 |
| Language | 70 | 14.4 | 23 | 5.1 |
| Content Areas | 67 | 13.8 | 24 | 5.3 |
| All Other Areas | 81 | 16.7 | 37 | 8.2 |
| Supervision/Administration | 3 | .6 | 36 | 8.0 |

Of the 294 program participants with graduate degrees, 289 reported their areas of specialization. Ninety-nine (34 percent) specialized in bilingual education, 44 (15 percent) specialized in elementary education, and 42 (15 percent) specialized in E.S.L. Seventy-five (26 percent) specialized in either early childhood, language, supervision/administration, secondary education, and content areas. Twenty-nine (10 percent) specialized in "other" areas.

Most participants, regardless of degree, were certified as bilingual teachers in grades K-6 (209 or 42 percent), bilingual

certification extension, (71 or 14 percent), or English as a second language (52 or 10 percent).

Of the participants who reported their years of teaching experience, 347 (70 percent) had an average of 4.7 years of experience teaching grades K-2; 316 (63 percent) also had experience teaching grades three to five for an average of 5.3 years; 270 (54 percent) reported teaching grades six through nine for an average of 5.3 years; and 162 (33 percent) taught high school for an average of 1.8 years.

Of the participants who reported their assignments, 231 (47 percent) were bilingual teachers and 147 (30 percent) were E.S.L. teachers. The majority of bilingual teachers had previous experience teaching in grades kindergarten through two (178 or 36 percent) or grades three through five (125 or 25 percent). Two hundred and forty-five (49 percent) had previous experience teaching E.S.L. in grades kindergarten through two. Another 265 E.S.L. teachers (53 percent) reported having previous experience teaching grades three through five. The remaining bilingual and E.S.L. teachers reported having previous experience teaching grades six through nine or grades ten through twelve.

Data regarding the current status/position of those participating in the program were available for 489 teachers; 235 (47 percent) were tenured; 114 (23 percent) were regular substitutes; 64 (13 percent) were probationary; and 76 (15 percent) were per diem substitutes.

## III. WORKSHOP DESCRIPTIONS

At each site, the program consisted of a guest keynote speaker on the first day, followed by 10 to 13 workshops. These workshops continued during the following three sessions.

The guest speakers were asked to give a general presentation on the history and development of bilingual education and an update on current regulations and statutory requirements. Each workshop series had a different keynote speaker; all were experienced practitioners from school districts or scholars from a university, and all had donated their services.

The workshops were conducted by paid field practitioners who were experienced bilingual/E.S.L. educators and had subject-area knowledge. Presenters were encouraged to provide hands-on activities, in addition to lectures and discussions. The presenters submitted course outlines for their workshop series to O.B.E. personnel. These outlines served as guides for instruction and discussion, but presenters were permitted modify their outlines after they had met with participants. This flexibility enabled presenters to better serve participants' special needs.

Three types of workshop were offered: one for supervisors and coordinators; one for new teachers; and one for experienced teachers. The workshops for teachers were designed for those who taught E.S.L. or bilingual/self-contained classes and for those who were bilingual/cluster teachers. If there were enough teachers, they were grouped by grade level. Participants were

assigned to workshops, but if they were dissatisfied with their assignment the site supervisors tried to assign them to another one in the same series. Although the workshops generally were conducted in English, in some cases Spanish was used either intermittently or exclusively. Each workshop had 18-22 participants.

Holding workshops at four different sites entailed a great deal of effort to transport materials and A-V equipment. From time to time, classrooms or presenters had to be changed, causing some confusion, but these changes were handled tactfully, and as quickly as possible.

WORKSHOPS FOR SUPERVISORS

These workshops were open to administrators, district coordinators, and non-teaching personnel. Each participant received a folder containing graphs of the number of LEP students in New York City; copies of regulations; procedures and forms for student testing, placement, and transfer; definitions of terms; and forms for ordering curricular materials. Each of the four sessions was addressed by a different speaker, who had expertise in a particular area, e.g., E.S.L. or program monitoring. These addresses were followed by seminar-type sessions in which participants had an opportunity to discuss how to improve policy and practice relating to LEP students.

WORKSHOPS FOR TEACHERS

These workshops served both new and experienced teachers.

They employed a lecture-and-discussion format during the first part of the session, followed by a hands-on activity during the second half. Presenters welcomed questions and invited participants to bring up their own classroom experiences. This part of the session was an important aspect of each workshop, particularly since all of the participants had just completed a full day of teaching. All the workshop leaders were expert presenters.

ATTENDANCE

-- Eighty percent of the bilingual/E.S.L. supervisors and kindergarten through ninth-grade teachers registered in the program will attend each of the four sessions proposed.

The training program consisted of four three-hour workshops at four sites in Brooklyn, the Bronx, Manhattan, and Queens. Each workshop consisted of a general meeting followed by eight to 13 small-group sessions.

Based on the number of evaluation forms returned (448 to 482, depending upon the site) and the proposed target group (500) the attendance objective was achieved and surpassed.

SATISFACTION

-- Ninety percent of the participants will be highly satisfied (an average rating of three or above on a five-point Likert Scale) with the clarity, scope, thoroughness, and usefulness of the training sessions, will have a positive overall assessment of the sessions, and will indicate they had learned a significant amount.

The questionnaire given to participants asked them to rate the clarity, scope, thoroughness, and usefulness of the presentations; to give an overall assessment of the sessions; and

to indicate how much they learned on a five-point Likert Scale (1=lowest; 5=highest).

The mean overall rating for each variable was 4.4 or higher, indicating that virtually all participants were highly pleased with the program. Thus, the proposed objective was achieved.

The overall means and standard deviations for each satisfaction variable are presented in Table 3. Satisfaction ratings were extremely high, ranging from 4.4 to 4.7, and standard deviations were extremely low, ranging from 0.65 to 0.85. This indicates that the majority of participants agreed that the Staff Development Program was an extremely positive experience.

TABLE 3

Overall Average Satisfaction Ratings* For Each Dimension

| Satisfaction Variable | N | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Clarity | 478 | 4.7 | .65 |
| Scope | 448 | 4.5 | .77 |
| Thoroughness | 450 | 4.6 | .73 |
| Usefulness | 450 | 4.5 | .85 |
| Overall Assessment | 482 | 4.6 | .74 |
| Amount Learned | 450 | 4.4 | .83 |

* Range = 1 to 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest).

- Overall, the participants were highly satisfied with the project.

## IV. FINDINGS

This report examines the extent to which the program achieved the objectives outlined in the proposal to the New York State Education Department. Data are based on the teacher background questionnaire; evaluation forms; observations conducted on-site at over half of the workshops and two of the four general sessions; formal interviews with the program director and site-supervisors on planning, implementation and future plans for similar sessions in the future; and informal interviews with participants.

The program implemented all proposed activities on time. Universities in each of the four boroughs originally had been proposed as sites, but it turned that out none were able to accommodate the project's large number of participants in mid-week evening sessions. Consequently, alternate sites were found in four high schools conveniently located near bus and subway lines.

The only unavoidable problem was that too much time was required to complete the necessary paperwork, particularly at the first session.

## V. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FINDINGS AND PARTICIPANTS' BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

### SATISFACTION RATINGS AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

An additional evaluation goal was to determine the relationship between participants' satisfaction ratings and their backgrounds. Correlations were computed to assess the relationship between each satisfaction dimension and the following background variables: years of experience as a bilingual teacher at different grade levels; years of experience as an E.S.L. teacher at different grade levels; and years of experience as a teacher at different grade levels. These variables were selected because they were the most complete and the most reliable of all the background variables for which information was supplied.

On the whole, it was found that participants' teaching experience was not strongly related to their satisfaction ratings. Years of experience as an E.S.L. teacher in grades three to five and in high school was the only category that was found to be significantly related to participants' satisfaction.

The satisfaction of E.S.L. teachers of grades three to five and of grades nine to twelve varied with their years of teaching experience. Specifically, third- to fifth-grade E.S.L. teachers with more years of experience rated the workshops higher on clarity ($r = .15$), scope ($r = .15$), usefulness ($r = .19$), and overall ($r = .14$) than those with fewer years of experience; and high school E.S.L. teachers with more experience found the

workshops more useful (r = .16).

Although these correlations are statistically significant, they are rather weak, suggesting that caution must be exercised in assigning too much weight to these relationships.

Overall, not all satisfaction dimensions were significantly correlated with proficiency ratings, and even correlations that were statistically significant were not strong. However, there was little variability among ratings because most participants, regardless of their teaching experience, agreed that their presenters and their presentations were very good. This lack of variability limits the potential magnitude of the observed correlations. In sum, although approval ratings were high, it appears that E.S.L. teachers with more experience liked the workshops more than those with less experience.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### CONCLUSIONS

The 1986-87 New York City Staff Development Program for Bilingual/E.S.L. Teachers and Supervisors clearly was a great success. It was extremely well planned and well implemented, and it made good use of the recommendations for change contained in previous years' evaluation reports. Specifically, the program was expanded to encompass a wider range of teachers; the four sites were conveniently located; sessions were held at convenient times; separate workshops were held for supervisors at each site; the amount of time participants spent with each presenter was extended; and teachers were placed in workshops according to common characteristics (e.g., area of specialization, years of teaching experience, and grade level).

As in previous years, the success of the project largely was due to commitment and support of the O.B.E. staff. This came from every level -- from the office of the director to the clerical staff. A strong team spirit was evident everywhere; speakers, workshop leaders, and participants were enthusiastic about the program; there were many positive interactions among staff members and participants, as evidenced by the exchange of phone numbers. In some cases, the end of the series was an emotional occasion at which gifts were given to the presenters, songs were sung, and hugs were exchanged.

Despite the apparent success of this program, its organizers were professionally self-critical, always striving to outdo their

best performance. For example, when asked what might be done differently next year, site supervisors said that they would like the series to be longer because they had found that four three-hour sessions do not provide enough time to do the job right. They also would ask for additional funds to hire well-known keynote speakers, and to be able to distribute free curriculum materials to the program participants.

Site supervisors also were asked to mention aspects of the program they would like to continue. They said they would continue to ask participants to produce a class or individual product, to keep one presenter per workshop, and to emphasize a hands-on approach for most workshops. According to the site supervisors, improved instructional skills and knowledge were the program's major accomplishments. They also noted that supervisory personnel had become more aware of the goals and regulations pertaining to bilingual/E.S.L. education. Finally, they said that integrating so many different types of educational professionals into a single training design had been a important achievement.

Based on the feedback she had received, the O.B.E. deputy director in change of the program said she felt that many participants had begun to see O.B.E. as more than a monitor or a policeman. She also said that the program brought together teachers from all parts of the system and gave them resources and skills that were immediately applicable in the classroom.

To sum up, interviews, questionnaires, and observations all

indicate that participants were highly satisfied with both the keynote presentations and the workshops offered in the 1986-87 staff development training program. Satisfaction was somewhat related to years of experience as an E.S.L. teacher of grades three to five, and to a lesser extent, to experience as an E.S.L. high school teacher. Overall, since most background variables were not statistically significant, it can safely be concluded that participants were highly satisfied with the program largely because of the high quality of the program.

The Staff Development Program is a model: it is innovative, well-organized, and well-implemented; it uses experienced staff at every level; it attends to participants' physical and psychological comfort; although it already offers high-quality services, it continues to improve; and it is responsive to the recommendations of evaluators.

## PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of its analysis of the program, the evaluation team offers the following recommendations for the planning of similar programs in the future:

1. Follow-up conferences may be in order. Such conferences would give participants a chance to reflect upon what they learned and to discuss the implementation of techniques learned in the main conference sessions.

2. Although the need for specialized training clearly is greatest for the teachers serving Hispanic LEP students because they constitute the largest single language-minority student population, teachers serving other language groups also need specialized training. Although it might not be possible or necessary to devote an entire series to these teachers, perhaps a few sessions could be devoted to their special needs.